

# **Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave III**

Kahle Research Solutions Inc.  
(248) 541-6200  
RWKahle@KahleResearch.com

## **Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II**

---

### **Introduction**

- The following is a brief summary of results of the Mentor Michigan Census (MMC), Wave III broken down by geographic area. Data referenced in this are shown on the attached data tables. Further information is included in the Executive Summary, the Frequently Asked Questions document or is available from Kahle Research Solutions. Detailed cross-tabulations are on file with both the Michigan Community Service Commission and Kahle Research Solutions.
- It is important to note that organizations have been placed in geographic groupings based on the main location of the mentoring organization. Some organizations serve youth only within their home county, while others serve multiple counties. Not all geographic groupings are mutually exclusive. For example, the Tri-County area covers Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties, which are also included in Southeast Michigan. As a result, percentages shown can be read only as a percent of the column (reading down), not across. The counties that comprise each of the larger regional geographic areas are listed in Table 1.
- As the geographic data was collected differently in Wave I than it was in Waves II and III, comparison of data in Wave I to data in Waves II and III at the regional level is not recommended. Wave II and III data, however, can be compared, as can state totals for all three waves.
- Sample sizes for the various geographic regions are sometimes quite small. Care should be used when making comparisons across regions. Differences by regions need to be quite large for the data to truly represent substantive differences rather than random statistical variation.

## **Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II**

---

### **Funnel Measures (see Table 2)**

- Thirty seven mentoring organizations responded to Wave III from Southeast Michigan. This is the largest number of mentoring organizations in any single geographic area. Of the 37 organizations serving clients in Southeast Michigan, 31 of these are within the Tri-County (Wayne, Oakland and Macomb) area. The other geographic areas and number of organizations responding:
  - Grand Rapids/Muskegon: 23
  - Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula: 22
  - Mid-Michigan: 17
  - Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area: 13
  - Southwest Michigan: 10
- Of the total 20,294 Michigan children served by mentoring organizations in the first eight months of 2005, the largest proportion (21%), is in the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area (4,851), followed by Southeast Michigan (3,891, of these 3,000 are within the Tri-County area), Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula, and Mid-Michigan, all with more than 3,000 youth served as of August 31, 2005.
- Organizations serving Southeast Michigan have the largest number of active mentors (as of August 31, 2005) in the state at 2,724, with 1,844 of those active in the Tri-County area. This is closely followed by organizations serving Northern Michigan / UP with 2,594 active mentors. Organizations serving Southwest Michigan report the smallest number (1,215) of active mentors.
- Respondents were asked to compare the number of youth served as of 8/31/05 compared to twelve months ago (8/31/04). Organizations serving Southeast Michigan have shown the largest net growth in the number of mentor/youth matches (519, 420 in the Tri-County Area). Growth is also reported in Mid-Michigan (188) and Northern Michigan / UP (179). The area showing the largest decline is Grand Rapids/Muskegon (-580), followed by Southwest Michigan (-143) and the Flint/Saginaw/Bay area (-47).

### **Inquiries, Applications and Screening**

- State mentoring organizations report that there were 8,816 inquiries received in the first eight months of 2005 regarding becoming a mentor. Organizations serving Southeast Michigan report the largest number of inquiries (2,384), followed by those

## **Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II**

---

serving Mid-Michigan (1,699). Organizations serving Southwest Michigan report the smallest number of inquiries at 686. Looking at monthly averages, state-wide there were an average of 1,102 inquiries each month. Monthly averages vary widely across geographic areas, with a high of 298 inquiries per month in Southeast Michigan, compared to a low of 86 inquiries per month in Southwest Michigan.

- There were a total of 5,973 written applications to become a mentor received by state organizations as of August 31, 2005. The largest number (1,456) are from organizations serving the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area. This compares to the 1,297 applications received by organizations in Southeast Michigan. Again looking at monthly averages, organizations report a statewide average of 747 written applications per month. As with the number of inquiries, Southwest Michigan organizations report the lowest average of written applications per month (59). The Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area reports the largest monthly average of written applications (182). This compares favorably to their average monthly inquiries (200).
- Use of the State Criminal Background Check is high, with 80% of mentoring organizations reporting its use. Organizations in the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area report using this screening method the most (93%), with the lowest usage reported in the Tri-County Area (70%). Written applications (87%), Personal Interviews (84%) and Personal Character References (81%) are also highly used screening methods for organizations state-wide.

### Intensity

- In Wave III a new time period (30 minutes per week) was added to measure the minimum time per week mentors spend with youth. Forty-one percent of organizations report having this as a requirement, well below the research-based minimum dose required to have a demonstrable effect. Fifty-six percent of organizations in Southwest Michigan reporting this as their minimum required, and Southeast Michigan (42%), Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula (47%) and the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area (50%) all report higher than state averages with this minimum time period.
- State-wide, only 2% of organizations report a minimum time per week of 2 hours/week. The exception to that is in Southwest Michigan, where 11% report this as a minimum, 11% report requiring 3 hours per week and another 11% report a minimum requirement of 6 hours per week.

## **Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II**

---

### **Demographic Profile (see Table 3)**

#### **Mentors**

- Sixty-seven percent of the state's mentors are women. The percentage of women mentors is highest in organizations serving Southwest Michigan (83%) and the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area (79%). Men are under-represented as mentors in every geographic area of the state.
- The age of mentors varies greatly by geographic area. The Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area has the highest percentage of mentors less than age 18 (35%). Southwest Michigan has a large 55 plus population working as mentors (35%). Grand Rapid/Muskegon also has a large 65 plus population of mentors. Strong Foster Grandparent programs in these areas are likely driving the large proportion of senior mentors, while peer and/or team mentoring cause the relatively high proportion of younger mentors in several of the regional areas.
- Michigan mentoring organizations report that their mentors are mostly Caucasian (72%), with the highest percentage of Caucasian mentors (98%) serving Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula. African-Americans serve as mentors most often in the Tri-County (43%) and Flint/Saginaw/Bay Areas (45%). Substantial numbers of Hispanic mentors are found in Mid-Michigan, Grand Rapids/Muskegon and the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area. Southwest Michigan, Mid-Michigan, Grand Rapids/Muskegon and Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula all report that 1% of their mentors are Native American.
- Organizations report having 284 mentors with disabilities, state-wide. Most of these are in Grand Rapids/Muskegon (122) and Southwest Michigan (119).

#### **Children Served**

- In total, organizations report the children they serve are about equally split between males than females. Southwest Michigan reports that 71% of its youth served are female. Mid-Michigan is the only geographic area to report serving more boys than girls (62%). All other areas of the state continue to serve more females than males, just as they did in Waves I and II.
- Like the mentors who befriend them, children served across the state are most often Caucasian (52%). The percentage of Caucasian children served is highest in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula (92%). The percentage of African-American youth served is highest in the Tri-County area and Southeast Michigan (66% and 50% respectively). In Grand Rapids/Muskegon,

## **Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II**

---

19% of the children served are Hispanic, while 4% of the children served in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula are Native American.

- Most children served by mentors are in the 6-11 or 12-14 age categories. Exceptions to this are found in Mid-Michigan, the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area and Southwest Michigan, all of whom report serving a large percentage of children under the age of 5. Northern Michigan/UP serves more children age 15-18 than anywhere else in the state (32%).
- Organizations report serving a total of 1,381 youth who have disabilities. The largest numbers reported are in the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area (552), Southwest Michigan (339), and Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula (321).

### **Site of Organization and Mentoring Type (see Table 4)**

- Throughout the state, 67% of mentoring matches are defined by reporting organizations as one mentor to one mentee, with comparatively fewer group (13%), peer (12%) and team (8%) mentoring programs being reported. This holds true through each geographic breakdown, with the exception of Mid-Michigan and the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area. Programs serving children in these areas report much more diversification in the type of programs offered, with peer and team mentoring being the next most common types.
- In Michigan, 61% of mentoring organizations are housed within non-profits. This holds true with each geographic area, ranging from a high of 80% serving Southwest Michigan to a low of 31% serving the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area. Schools are the second most common type of mentoring organization (11% state-wide), with the highest number of those (18%) serving Mid-Michigan. Thirty-eight percent of organizations serving the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area report their site organizations as “Other”. This area also reports having a significant number (15%) of its organizations government-based, as do Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula (20%) and Mid-Michigan (12%). This compares to a state-wide average of only 7%.

## **Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II**

---

### **Adherence to Mentor Michigan's Quality Program Standards (see Table 5)**

NOTE: For purposes of evaluation, Standard #3, Eligibility Screening, has been broken down to report on screening for mentors and screening for mentees.

- In total, 72% of organizations report having read the MM Quality Program Standards prior to reading them online. This compares to a high of 94% of organizations in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula and a low of 48% of organizations in the Tri-County Area. The high percentage in Northern Michigan/Upper Peninsula may be due to the Provider's Council leadership residing in the Upper Peninsula.
- Adherence to each of the individual standards varies widely across geographic areas. Less than half of the organizations report that they fully adhere to nine of the standards. However, when organizations reporting that they somewhat meet the standards are combined with those who fully meet them, more than 70% of organizations report that they fully meet or somewhat meet 10 of the 11 standards.
- State-wide, the highest level of adherence is for Standard #1, Definition of Mentoring. Sixty-three percent of organizations report that they fully adhere to this standard, and another 27% somewhat meet it. Match Monitoring (#6), Eligibility Screening for Mentees (#3), and Matching Strategy (#5) follow in levels of full adherence with over half of organizations reporting that they fully meet these standards.
- The lowest level of adherence reported is for Match Closure (#11), with only 38% of organizations reporting that they fully meet this standard.
- The Tri-County area reports the lowest adherence rates in the state (23% to 42%) for eight of the standards, is tied for the lowest on one, and is within a few percentage points of being the lowest for two others. Only with standard #4, Orientation and Training, does this geographic area report adherence levels consistent with the state average (47% state-wide, 42% for the Tri-County area).
- Southwest Michigan reports the highest adherence rates in the state (60% to 90%) for seven of the standards, is tied for the highest on one, and is within a few percentage points of being the highest for two others.
- At least 10% of organizations in the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area report that they do not meet any of the standards. For standard #8, Match Closure, this percentage climbs to 20%.

## **Mentoring by Geographic Area in the State of Michigan: Results from the Mentor Michigan Census, Wave II**

---

### **Mentor Michigan: Satisfaction (see Table 6)**

- Fifty-one percent of mentoring organizations report being “very satisfied” with Mentor Michigan, with 36% “somewhat satisfied.” This satisfaction level is generally consistent across geographic areas.
- While state-wide only 5% of organizations report being “not very satisfied” with Mentor Michigan, those in Mid-Michigan (15%), the Flint/Saginaw/Bay Area (10%) and Southwest Michigan (10%) seem least satisfied.
- None of the organizations report being “not at all satisfied” with Mentor Michigan, with only 2% report being unaware of the work of Mentor Michigan.



**Table 1**  
**County Breakdown**

<b>Geographic Area</b>	<b>Counties Included:</b>
<b>Tri-County</b>	Macomb, Oakland, Wayne
<b>SE MI</b>	Lapeer, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw, Wayne
<b>SW MI</b>	Allegan, Barry, Berrien, Cass, Kalamazoo, St. Joseph, Van Buren
<b>Mid-Mich</b>	Branch, Calhoun, Eaton, Hillsdale, Ingham, Jackson, Lenawee
<b>GR/Musk</b>	Clinton, Gratiot, Ionia, Kent, Mecosta, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newago, Oceana, Ottawa
<b>Flint/Sag/Bay Area</b>	Bay, Genesee, Huron, Isabella, Midland, Saginaw, Sanilac, Shiawasee, Tuscola
<b>Northern/UP</b>	Alcona, Alger, Alpena, Antrim, Arenac, Baraga, Benzie, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Chippewa, Clare, Crawford, Delta, Dickinson, Emmet, Gladwill, Gogebec, Grand Traverse, Houghton, Iosco, Iron, Kalkaska, Keweenaw, Lake, Leelenau, Luce, Mackinac, Manistee, Marquette, Mason, Menominee, Misauke, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Ontonagon, Osceola, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Ilse, Roscommon, Schoolcraft, Wexford

**Table 2**  
**Funnel Measures Summary Table**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave III Total</b>	<b>Tri- County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid- Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/ UP</b>
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	123	31	37	10	17	23	13	22
17	Number of inquiries to be a mentor	8,816	1,723	2,384	686	1,699	1,609	1,599	839
	Monthly Average	1,102	215	298	86	212	201	200	105
18	Number of written applications to be a mentor	5,973	933	1,297	472	938	567	1,456	1,243
	Monthly Average	747	117	162	59	117	71	182	155
26	Background Check - [M.R.]								
	State Criminal Background Check	80%	70%	77%	94%	76%	82%	93%	77%
	Federal Criminal Background Check	28	41	39	44	33	14	21	14
	Sex Offender Registry	59	48	58	56	36	64	79	70
	Child Abuse Registry	41	55	51	44	24	29	57	44
	Drive record/license	52	48	49	50	58	61	64	42
	Personal character reference	81	68	75	89	79	79	86	88
	Employment reference	35	30	26	33	42	54	43	26
	Written application	87	70	77	89	91	89	79	95
	Personal interview	84	73	79	100	76	86	93	86
	Home visit	11	0	4	6	9	4	29	23
	Home Assessment	15	2	5	22	21	7	21	21
	Fingerprint Check	11	23	18	6	3	4	7	16
	None of the above	5	11	9	0	3	7	0	2
19	Mentees Served								
	Total	20,294	3,000	3,891	1,858	3,104	2,922	4,851	3,668
	Mean per Organization	114	71	73	103	107	104	404	97

**Table 2**  
**Funnel Measures Summary Table**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave III Total</b>	<b>Tri- County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid- Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/ UP</b>
25	Total number of matches								
	Percent of organizations reporting an increase	38%	48%	46%	33%	48%	46%	14%	26%
	Percent of organizations reporting a decrease	15	14	16	22	15	14	7	12
	Percent of organizations reporting no change	48	11	14	7	8	4	8	7
	Don't Know	22	14	14	6	12	25	21	47
	Increased #	1,975	614	759	162	244	485	42	283
	Decreased #	1,859	194	240	305	56	1,065	89	104
	Net Change #	116	420	519	-143	188	-580	-47	179
22	Active mentors	11,767	1,844	2,724	1,215	1,564	1,953	1,717	2,594
23	Mentors currently on waiting list	1,124	336	464	61	205	108	102	184
24	Mentees currently on waiting list	3,311	569	964	385	177	808	329	648
28	Minimum time of mentor/mentee match								
	No minimum	14%	11%	19%	0%	15%	18%	21%	7%
	1-2 months	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	14
	3-5 months	6	5	4	0	15	11	7	2
	6-8 months	18	20	16	17	18	21	7	21
	9-11 months	19	20	21	50	9	11	7	21
	12 months	32	36	35	28	30	32	43	28
	More than 12 Months, less than 2 years	1	2	2	0	3	0	0	0
	More than 2 years, less than 5 years	3	2	2	6	0	4	0	7
	More than 5 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	0
	Don't know	2	2	2	0	6	4	0	0

**Table 2**  
**Funnel Measures Summary Table**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave III Total</b>	<b>Tri-County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid-Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/UP</b>
29	Average time for mentor/mentee match								
	No minimum	4%	7%	5%	0%	6%	4%	7%	2%
	1 – 2 months	3	7	5	0	6	0	0	0
	3 – 5 months	11	7	9	0	18	11	0	16
	6 – 8 months	17	23	21	6	18	21	21	9
	9 – 11 months	16	16	21	6	3	18	14	21
	12 months	13	20	18	22	18	4	14	7
	More than 12 months, less than 2 years	13	5	7	6	12	21	21	19
	More than 2 years, less than 5 years	11	9	9	17	6	11	0	21
	More than 5 years	3	0	0	17	3	0	7	2
	Don't know	9	7	5	28	9	11	14	2
30	Minimum time per week for mentor/mentee match								
	No minimum	16%	11%	12%	6%	24%	18%	29%	14%
	30 minutes / week	41	39	42	56	30	29	50	47
	1 hour / week	16	18	16	0	21	36	14	7
	2 hours / week	2	2	2	11	0	0	0	2
	3 hours / week	4	7	5	11	3	4	0	0
	4 hours / week	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
	5 hours / week	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	6 hours / week	4	7	5	11	3	4	7	0
	More than 6 hours / week	6	5	4	0	12	4	0	9
	Don't know	10	9	12	6	6	7	0	19
27	Number of hours in-person training for mentors								
	None	4%	0%	11%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%
	Less than 1 hour	7	5	7	6	3	14	0	9
	1 – 2 hours	25	25	19	39	24	21	14	33
	2 – 4 hours	23	32	30	22	30	14	36	9
	4 – 6 hours	9	7	7	0	15	14	14	5
	6 – 8 hours	10	11	9	6	6	14	0	19
	9 or more hours	15	18	14	28	6	18	36	9
	Don't know	7	2	4	0	15	0	0	16

**Table 3**  
**Demographic Profile Table**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave III Total</b>	<b>Tri- County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid-Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/ UP</b>
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	123	31	37	10	17	23	13	22
32	Mentor Gender								
	Males	33%	34%	36%	17%	41%	31%	21%	33%
	Females	67	66	64	83	59	69	79	67
33	Mentor Age								
	< 18	20%	19%	17%	9%	11%	16%	35%	19%
	18 – 25	22	11	17	5	23	17	39	12
	26 – 35	16	24	22	13	20	17	6	16
	36 – 45	14	22	21	11	21	12	2	16
	46 – 55	10	17	16	9	9	6	4	19
	56 – 65	8	6	5	17	7	12	3	14
	65 +	11	1	2	35	10	20	12	5
34	Mentor Race								
	Caucasian	72%	54%	70%	70%	79%	77%	52%	98%
	African-American	24	43	27	27	13	15	45	1
	Hispanic	2	1	1	2	4	4	3	<1
	Native American	1	<1	<1	1	1	1	<1	1
	Asian-American	1	1	<1	0	2	1	<1	<1
	Arab-American	1	1	<1	0	2	1	0	0
	Other	<1	<1	<1	1	1	1	0	0
35	Number of Mentors with Disabilities	284	2	2	119	15	122	24	2

**Table 3**  
**Demographic Profile Table**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

Q #	Question	Wave III Total	Tri- County	SE MI	SW MI	Mid-Mich	GR / Musk	Flint/Sag / Bay Area	Northern/ UP
36	Youth Served Gender Males	46%	44%	44%	29%	62%	45%	44%	40%
	Females	54	56	56	71	38	55	56	60
37	Youth Served Age < 5	21%	1%	1%	38%	51%	5%	42%	4%
	6 – 11	38	40	51	45	21	29	42	33
	12 – 14	21	32	27	9	6	39	10	30
	15 – 18	18	26	20	4	18	22	4	32
	19 – 21	1	<1	<1	1	3	2	2	1
	22 – 25	<1	<1	1	<1	0	0	1	0
	26 +	<1	0	<1	2	0	3	0	0
38	Youth Served Race Caucasian	52%	24%	42%	61%	49%	41%	94%**	92%
	African-American	36	66	50	31	38	36	6	2
	Hispanic	6	4	3	6	7	19	0	1
	Native American	1	<1	<1	0	1	2	0	4
	Asian-American	1	<1	1	0	1	<1	0	<1
	Arab-American	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
	Other	3	4	3	2	4	1	0	1
39	Number of Youth Served with Disabilities	1,381	37	27	339	49	83	552	321

\*\*This number is not considered valid as race information was NOT collected for most of the youth served in this area.

**Table 4**  
**Organization Site and Mentoring Type**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave III Total</b>	<b>Tri- County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid-Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/ UP</b>
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	123	31	37	10	17	23	13	22
13	Site of Organization								
	School	11%	13%	11%	10%	18%	17%	8%	0%
	Nonprofit	61	71	76	80	41	61	31	60
	Faith-based organization	5	6	5	0	6	13	0	0
	Government	7	0	0	0	12	0	15	20
	Higher Education Institute	3	3	3	0	6	4	8	0
	Other	0	6	5	10	18	4	38	20
21	Mentoring Type								
	One to One	67%	55%	61%	90%	69%	58%	45%	81%
	Group	13	16	12	9	2	26	10	12
	Peer	12	17	18	2	2	6	39	2
	Team	8	11	8	<1	27	9	6	5
	E-mentoring	<1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0

**Table 5**  
**Mentor Michigan Quality Program Standards**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave III Total</b>	<b>Tri- County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid-Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/ UP</b>
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	123	31	37	10	17	23	13	22
40	Have you read the MM Program Standards?								
	Yes	72%	48%	50%	80%	81%	86%	55%	94%
	No	28	52	50	20	19	14	45	6
41	1. Definition of Mentoring								
	Fully Meets Standard	63%	42%	47%	80%	67%	67%	70%	72%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	27	38	37	20	13	33	20	22
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	9	19	17	0	20	0	0	6
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
	2. Recruitment Plan								
	Fully Meets Standard	49%	31%	33%	70%	53%	57%	50%	50%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	29	42	40	30	13	29	20	28
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	18	23	23	0	33	10	20	17
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	4	4	3	0	0	5	10	6
	3a. Eligibility Screening - Mentees								
	Fully Meets Standard	55%	23%	30%	90%	53%	67%	60%	61%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	21	31	30	10	20	14	20	22
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	17	38	33	0	27	5	10	11
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	7	8	7	0	0	14	10	6
	3b. Eligibility Screening - Mentors								
	Fully Meets Standard	42%	27%	33%	50%	27%	52%	50%	50%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	35	35	30	50	53	33	20	28
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	18	31	30	0	13	10	20	22
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	5	8	7	0	7	5	10	0



**Table 5**  
**Mentor Michigan Quality Program Standards**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave III Total</b>	<b>Tri- County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid-Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/ UP</b>
	<b>4. Orientation and Training</b>								
	Fully Meets Standard	47%	42%	40%	90%	40%	48%	70%	28%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	30	27	27	0	33	43	0	50
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	20	27	30	10	27	10	20	17
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	3	4	3	0	0	0	10	6
	<b>5. Matching Strategy</b>								
	Fully Meets Standard	53%	35%	40%	60%	53%	62%	50%	61%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	26	35	33	40	20	19	20	22
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	17	27	23	0	20	14	20	17
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	4	4	3	0	7	5	10	0
	<b>6. Match Monitoring Process</b>								
	Fully Meets Standard	56%	35%	40%	80%	53%	67%	60%	56%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	21	27	27	20	20	14	10	28
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	18	31	27	0	20	14	20	17
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	5	8	7	0	7	5	10	0
	<b>7. Mentor Support, Recognition, Retention</b>								
	Fully Meets Standard	42%	35%	40%	60%	53%	33%	50%	33%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	31	27	23	30	20	52	20	33
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	21	35	30	10	20	10	10	33
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	6	4	7	0	7	5	20	0
	<b>8. Match Closure</b>								
	Fully Meets Standard	38%	23%	30%	60%	33%	43%	30%	39%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	22	23	20	30	33	19	10	22
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	31	38	37	10	27	29	40	33
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	10	15	13	0	7	10	20	6

**Table 5**  
**Mentor Michigan Quality Program Standards**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave III Total</b>	<b>Tri- County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid-Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/ UP</b>
	9. Program Evaluation								
	Fully Meets Standard	45%	38%	43%	70%	33%	43%	60%	39%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	29	31	27	30	27	33	20	33
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	21	27	23	0	27	24	10	28
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	5	4	7	0	13	0	10	0
	10. Organizational Management								
	Fully Meets Standard	45%	31%	37%	60%	33%	52%	60%	44%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	31	31	27	40	27	38	20	33
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	14	23	20	0	27	5	10	17
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	10	15	17	0	13	5	10	6
	11. Governance								
	Fully Meets Standard	41%	35%	40%	60%	33%	43%	40%	39%
	Meets Standard in Most Ways	29	23	20	20	33	33	30	39
	Meets Standard in Some Ways	23	31	27	20	33	19	20	17
	Does Not Meet Standard at All	7	12	13	0	0	5	10	6

**Table 6**  
**Satisfaction with Mentor Michigan**  
**Total and Geographic Breakdowns**

<b>Q #</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Wave II Total</b>	<b>Tri- County</b>	<b>SE MI</b>	<b>SW MI</b>	<b>Mid-Mich</b>	<b>GR / Musk</b>	<b>Flint/Sag / Bay Area</b>	<b>Northern/ UP</b>
	Number of Mentoring Organizations	123	31	37	10	17	23	13	22
43	How satisfied are you with MM?								
	% Very – 4	51%	52%	52%	40%	38%	70%	20%	59%
	% Somewhat – 3	36	35	32	50	31	30	60	29
	% Not very – 2	5	4	4	10	15	0	10	0
	% Not at all – 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Not aware of MM work	2	4	4	0	8	0	0	0
	% Don't Know	6	4	8	0	8	0	10	12
	MEAN	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.1	3.7